

needed technical assistance and services to a variety of industries including our National Labs.

Mr. President, for its outstanding accomplishments, I would like to commend the students, teachers and administration of the Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute for 30 years of service to the community and to the State of New Mexico.●

JOYCE FOUNDATION PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a longtime friend of mine, Lawrence Hansen, vice president of the Joyce Foundation, sent me a copy of a speech made by Deborah Leff, the president of the Joyce Foundation, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the League of Women Voters of the State of Illinois.

The subject of her address is campaign financing.

It contains material that would be startling to most citizens though, unfortunately, not startling to those of us who serve in the Senate.

While the bulk of her remarks are about campaign financing, I want to quote one item that is not. She says:

I am saddened by the media's increasing tendency to exploit, entertain and titillate, leaving us less informed about public affairs and more cynical about politics.

She announces that the Joyce Foundation will make a 3-year, \$2.3 million special study on money and politics.

While the emphasis of her project will be the State of Illinois, clearly she draws lessons from what has happened at the national level, and we should draw lessons beyond the State of Illinois.

For example, she says:

In 1976, the average cost of winning a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives was less than \$80,000. Last year, it leveled off at \$525,000. Between 1990 and 1992 alone, the cost of winning a House seat jumped by 33 percent. In fact, 45 House candidates in 1994 spent over \$1 million each.

On PACs, Ms. Leff says:

To understand the competitive effects of the current campaign finance system, consider the giving habits of political action committees—PACs. Last year, PACs distributed close to \$142 million to House candidates, three-quarters of which went to incumbents. To appreciate the enormity of this bias, it's worth noting that the winning candidates last year raised more money from PACs than their challengers generated from all sources, including from PACs, individual contributors, their own donations and loans.

She is concerned, as we should be concerned, the present system of financing campaign makes our political institutions unrepresentative. She observes:

The skewed distribution of political money is not just a problem for challengers. There's another—and some would argue more pernicious—side to this imbalance. The campaign finance system favors wealthy candidates over poor candidates, male candidates over female candidates, and white candidates over African-American and Latino candidates. And this bias continues

to be reflected in the composition of many legislative bodies.

Although less than one-half of one percent of the American people are millionaires, there are today at least 72 millionaires in the U.S. House of Representatives and 29 in the U.S. Senate. (And these figures don't include Michael Huffington, who spent \$5 million of his own money to win a House seat in 1992 and an additional \$28 million last year in his failed bid to become a Senator.) There is something terribly wrong when millionaires are over-represented in the "People's House" by a factor of 3,000 percent and in the Senate by a factor of more than 5,000 percent.

The president of the Joyce Foundation also notes something every one of us knows to be the fact:

Candidates' increased reliance on television ads has led to less informative and more mean-spirited campaigns. We are told that attack ads work; they must, because why else would candidates invest so much money in this stuff? But who really benefits and at what cost to the political system? The public is fed slivers of information, often deceptively presented. Real issues are not discussed. The most obvious victim, of course, is a political tradition that once prided itself in allowing serious candidates to debate serious issues in a serious way.

Then, she says something that I do not know to be a fact, but, as far as I know, it is accurate. She tells her audience:

The United States is the only major democracy that neither restricts the amount of money candidates can spend on broadcast advertising nor regulates their access to and use of this powerful medium. As a result, the quality of the nation's political discourse has declined sharply. And so, too, has the public's confidence in the veracity and judgment of our leaders.

A minor correction I would make to her speech is that she refers to \$100 million being spent to defeat health care. Newsweek magazine uses the figure \$400 million, and I believe that Newsweek magazine is correct.

She also notes:

In 1992, half of all the money raised by congressional candidates—\$335 million—was provided by one-third of 1 percent of the American people.

Deborah Leff has a number of illustrations of the abuses. They include references to my friend, the former speaker of the Illinois House, Michael Madigan, and the current speaker of the Illinois House, Lee Daniels. What Michael Madigan and Lee Daniels are doing is using the present system. I do not fault them for that. But what Ms. Leff is saying is that the system should be changed, and I agree with her.

She does not call for any specific program of change.

My own belief is that at the Federal level, we have to have dramatic change, and it will not come about without the President of the United States really pushing for change. The system I would like to have is a check-off contribution of \$3 or \$5 on our income tax that would go to major candidates for the Senate and the House, and no other money could be spent. Then, in a State like Illinois, instead of spending \$8 million or \$10 million on a

campaign, the candidates could spend \$2 million, and have some required free time made available by radio and televisions, not for 30-second spots, but for statements of up to five minutes by the candidates in which there is a serious discussion of the issues.

I ask that the full Deborah Leff speech be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues of both parties and their staffs to read the Deborah Leff speech.

The material follows:

SPEECH OF DEBORAH LEFF, PRESIDENT, THE JOYCE FOUNDATION AT THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ILLINOIS—JUNE 2, 1995

INTRODUCTION

I am delighted to be here this evening and to play a small role in celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the League of Women Voters. No organization in this century has contributed more to expanding informed citizen participation in the political process and can legitimately claim more victories for democracy than the league. Yours is a proud legacy, and I salute you.

Through the years the Joyce Foundation has frequently partnered with the league. We have labored together to simplify the Nation's voter registration laws—and despite some unseemly footdragging here in the land of Lincoln and several other States, we have made real progress. I read in the newspaper a few weeks ago that in the few months since the Motor Voter Act was put into effect early this year, two million new voters have been registered. Two million. It's a wonderful number. And you should be very proud.

Joyce also stood with the league in its efforts to institutionalize presidential debates, and happily that has occurred.

Two years ago, we supported the "wired for democracy" project. This collaborative effort, involving the national league and a number of State and local chapters, has been exploring ways of making greater use of communication technologies to meet the informational needs of citizens.

And last year we joined forces with you in an ambitious experiment to make the Illinois gubernatorial race more issue-oriented. The goal was to enable the people of Illinois to identify their major policy concerns, frame an issues agenda, and engage the candidates for Governor in a conversation about their visions and plans for the State's future. That the candidates took less notice of these citizens' messages than they should have only confirms how desperately we need new and inventive ways for reconnecting people and their elected representatives. The "Illinois voter project" was a valiant and useful attempt to bridge that gulf, and Joyce was glad to play a part.

A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Will Rogers once wrote, "I don't make jokes, I just watch the government and report the facts." And although we have much to celebrate tonight, there are a lot of facts to report. And, unfortunately, they're not funny. A terrible malaise has settled over our democracy. The fact is millions of our fellow citizens are fed up with politics. They feel left out, disconnected, unheard, unappreciated and powerless. And in frustration and anger, they are abandoning the system in droves. The signs of discontent are myriad. I'll mention only a few:

Three out of four Americans today say they "trust government in Washington" only "some of the time" or "almost never." In the mid-1960s, only 30 percent—rather than 75 percent—of Americans felt that way. (Roper Organization)

Nearly 60 percent of us believe that "the people running the country don't really care what happens to us." (Louis Harris)

Public approval of Congress almost reached rock bottom in 1994.

The Roper organization reports that millions of citizens have withdrawn from community affairs over the last 20 years. In 1973 one in four American adults said they attended a public meeting on community or school business during the year. Two years ago, only 13 percent of us claimed we had attended such forums.

And from a relatively high point in the early 1960s, voter turnout in national elections has declined by nearly a quarter. In State and local elections, the trends are even worse. Only 37 percent of Chicago's voters bothered to participate in February's mayoral and aldermanic primary election; and just over 40 percent went to the polls in April's general election, marketing the lowest turnout in a city election in more than a half century.

I wish I could report that these discontents were traceable to a single cause, to some easily identified and manageable condition. But clearly, as everybody in this room recognizes, that is not the case.

We know, for example, that economic anxieties are taking a toll on our civic life. Millions of Americans have grown pessimistic about getting ahead in a rapidly changing economy. Many are struggling just to stay even, and they blame government for their plight.

We know that the breakdown of traditional institutions, like families and schools, and an accompanying rise in social pathologies have deepened the public's despair about the political system.

We know that civic education is in a deplorable state and that the ranks of those voluntary organizations that have traditionally and energetically labored over the years to fill this vacuum are today greatly depleted.

As some of you know, I worked for the news media for years. I respect the news media, and I often admire it. But I am saddened by the media's increasing tendency to exploit, entertain and titillate, leaving us less informed about public affairs and more cynical about politics.

We know that technology, television, and talk radio can reinforce our isolation and exacerbate social divisions rather than fostering the cooperative, tolerant, and generous spirit which a democracy requires.

And then there's the issue of money in politics—an old and spirited demon with which both the league and the Joyce Foundation have done battle off and on over the years. As Senator Bill Bradley recently noted,

"Make no mistake, money talks in American politics today as never before. No revival of our democratic culture can occur until citizens feel that their participation is more meaningful than the money lavished by pacs and big donors."

The fundamental problem, Bradley says, is that "the rich have a loudspeaker and everyone else gets by with a megaphone." And, of course, he's absolutely right. The Joyce Foundation believes that overhauling the campaign finance system is as urgent a piece of unfinished business on the Nation's crowded policy agenda as any other.

You know, Eleanor Roosevelt once wrote, "I think if the people of this country can be reached with the truth, their judgment will be in favor of the many, instead of the privileged few." We want a Government for the many, a Government where the concerns of the citizenry are respected and addressed. And for that reason, the Joyce Foundation decided last year to launch a 3-year, \$2.3 million special project on money and politics.

Campaign finance reform is not a sexy issue. It doesn't get enough attention from the media, and it doesn't get enough attention from foundations. But I want, in my remaining time with you, to talk about why this problem is so critical to the future of America, and why it must be taken on.

THE PROBLEM

As you know, the financing of political campaigns is governed by a patchwork of laws and regulations. Federal candidates operate under one set of rules; State and local candidates under others. The variations among jurisdictions are endless, but these systems have one thing in common: they don't work very well. Let me briefly discuss their most obvious deficiencies, leaving to last what I regard as the most compelling argument for reform.

Problem 1: The current system has allowed campaign costs to rise to prohibitive levels

The cost of running for public office has skyrocketed over the past 20 years, especially at the Federal and State levels. Few campaign finance laws make any effort to restrain spending.

In 1976, the average cost of winning a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives was less than \$80,000. Last year, it leveled off at \$525,000. Between 1990 and 1992 alone, the cost of winning a House seat jumped by 33 percent. In fact, 45 House candidates in 1994 spent over \$1 million each.

The same pattern can be seen here in Illinois. Five State Senate candidates spent more than \$500,000 each in their 1992 campaigns. The 20 most expensive Senate races that year cost over \$5 million.

These trends have had three effects. First, they have rendered public service unaffordable for a growing number of qualified citizens of ordinary means.

Second, the escalating costs of campaigns are making it easier for wealthy and well-connected citizens to win public office.

And third, those willing to pay the price of admission find themselves spending more time begging than meeting voters, doing their policy homework, and governing.

Problem 2: Under the current campaign finance system, money, more than any other factor, determines who wins and loses elections

As a general rule, candidates who raise and spend the most almost always win. Cash—not the qualifications, character and policy views of candidates—has increasingly become the currency of democracy.

In last year's election, House incumbents on average outspent their opponents by nearly 3-to-1 (\$572,388 vs. \$206,663), and despite the public's anger with Congress and a higher than usual turnover in the House, 90 percent of the incumbents survived. In fact, 72 percent of House incumbents running in last fall's election outraised their challengers by \$200,000 or more, and 23 percent outdistanced their opponents by at least \$500,000. If a challenger did not spend at least \$250,000—and fewer than one-third of last year's challengers reached that threshold, his or her chances of winning were only one in a hundred.

Problem 3: The current campaign finance system has made elections less competitive

The current rules tilt so heavily in favor of incumbent officeholders that most challengers cannot hope to win. As a result, large numbers of elections that should be competitive rarely are.

In 1994, less than one in three congressional races were financially competitive. In fact, four out of five House incumbents faced challengers with so little money—typically less than 50 percent of the amount available to the incumbent—that they did not pose a serious threat.

To understand the competitive effects of the current campaign finance system, consider the giving habits of political action committees—PAC's. Last year, PAC's distributed close to \$142 million to House candidates, three-quarters of which went to incumbents. To appreciate the enormity of this bias, it's worth noting that the winning candidates last year raised more money from PAC's than their challengers generated from all sources, including from PAC's, individual contributors, their own donations and loans.

The real losers, of course, are voters. As elections become less competitive and as the range of candidate and policy decisions voters must make narrows, there is less and less reason to go to the polls. Under the circumstances people cannot be entirely blamed for staying away.

Problem 4: Because of the campaign finance system's inherent biases, many of our representative institutions remain terribly unrepresentative.

The skewed distribution of political money is not just a problem for challengers. There's another—and some would argue more pernicious—side to this imbalance. The campaign finance system favors wealthy candidates over poor candidates, male candidates over female candidates, and white candidates over African-American and Latino candidates. And this bias continues to be reflected in the composition of many legislative bodies.

Although less than one-half of one percent of the American people are millionaires, there are today at least 72 millionaires in the U.S. House of Representatives and 29 in the U.S. Senate. (And these figures don't include Michael Huffington, who spent \$5 million of his own money to win a House seat in 1992 and an additional \$28 million last year in his failed bid to become a Senator.) There is something terribly wrong when millionaires are over-represented in the "people's house" by a factor of 3,000 percent and in the Senate by a factor of more than 5,000 percent.

When 64 House and Senate candidates can reach into their own pockets and give their campaigns a \$100,000 shot in the arm, as occurred last year, it takes your breath away. Twelve of these candidates, let me add, invested more than \$1 million each in their campaigns.

These financial disparities are not limited to just rich and poor candidates. In 1991, white candidates for the Chicago city council raised five times more money than African-American candidates and one and a half times more than Latino candidates. If African-Americans had to run regularly against white or Latino candidates in racially and ethnically mixed wards, they would likely operate at a severe financial disadvantage. And given the importance of money, their chances of being elected from such wards would at best be problematic.

As I am sure you know, never in the long history of this city has an African-American represented a predominantly white ward. And were it not for the voting rights act which has helped to mitigate the financial disadvantages experienced by minority candidates, the city council would almost certainly be less representative of Chicago's diversity than it is today.

Problem 5: The current campaign finance system has made legislators and candidates too financially dependent on a small number of legislative leaders.

The past decade has witnessed a proliferation of political action committees established and controlled by Federal and State legislative leaders. These entities, which attract enormous amounts of special interest money, provide an alternative way of getting

money to favored candidates. However, these conduits—which are perfectly legal—also allow leaders to solidify their positions within their party caucuses, exercise greater control over members and increase their influence over a range of legislative matters.

This trend has not only accelerated the decline of political parties but has led to an unhealthy financial dependence by many rank and file legislators on their leaders and, according to some experts, to a diminution of their independence. There was a time, of course, when leaders earned the loyalty of their followers; today, loyalty is increasingly a purchasable commodity. That is not a good development.

In 1994, Federal leadership PACS distributed more than \$3.6 million to congressional candidates. But what has occurred in Illinois makes the growth and reach of Federal leadership PACS look trivial in comparison. Last year, Michael Madigan, then the speaker of the Illinois house, controlled a \$5.3 million war chest, and his Republican counterpart, Lee Daniels, the current speaker, had \$2.5 million at his disposal. Much of this nearly \$8 million was directed to candidates in 23 pivotal legislative races in which the candidates on their own had already raised \$4.5 million.

Although I have not seen a detailed analysis of how these leadership funds were distributed last year, I can tell you what occurred in 1992. The Democratic House candidates running in 21 targeted races that year received on average \$81,000 from the Madigan fund. Of all the money spent by those candidates, nearly 60 percent came from this single source. It is not hard to believe that those Democrats who won feel a special debt of gratitude for the speakers generosity.

Problem 6: The current campaign finance system has coarsened the political dialogue in this country

Costly broadcast advertising has driven up campaign costs. But that is not the only problem. Candidates' increased reliance on television ads has led to less informative and more mean-spirited campaigns. We are told that attack ads work; they must, because why else would candidates invest so much money in this stuff? But who really benefits and at what cost to the political system? The public is fed slivers of information, often deceptively presented. Real issues are not discussed. The most obvious victim, of course, is a political tradition that once prided itself in allowing serious candidates to debate serious issues in a serious way.

The United States is the only major democracy that neither restricts the amount of money candidates can spend on broadcast advertising nor regulates their access to and use of this powerful medium. As a result, the quality of the Nation's political discourse has declined sharply. And so, too, has the public's confidence in the veracity and judgment of our leaders.

Problem 7: The campaign finance system has driven people out of the electoral process and reduced their role to voting on election day

The last 30 years have witnessed what can only be described as a hostile take-over of the election process by highly paid and often unaccountable professional operatives. The campaign finance system has spawned an industry of pollsters, ad producers, time-buyers, professional fundraisers, direct-mail specialists and spin-doctors. Their exorbitant demands on campaign resources require that ever increasing amounts of money be raised. It is a trend that leaves little room in campaigns for the citizen-volunteers who were once the backbone of most campaigns. The ascendancy of political consultants has robbed our politics of the fun, hoopla, and

sadly, much of the substance once commonly associated with campaigns.

Problem 8: The campaign finance system all too often elevates or appears to elevate private interests over the public interest

Of all the system's shortcomings, this by far is the most serious. When citizens on a large scale harbor suspicions about the fairness and integrity of policymaking and regulatory processes, as is clearly the case today, it casts doubts on the legitimacy of the political system itself.

VIGNETTES

Hardly a week passes without some news report about how special interest money is being used to skew policy priorities, shape legislation and influence regulatory decisions. Elected officials may find the suggestion offensive, but a growing number of Americans are convinced that those who pay the piper also call the tune. Let me give you some examples.

Tort Reform. When Illinois State legislators on one side of the tort reform debate accept nearly \$2 million in campaign contributions as well as business contracts from the Illinois State Medical Society, and lawmakers on the other side accept nearly half a million dollars from the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association and tens of thousands of dollars from individual members, what are we to think? Would it be unfair to conclude that the public interest may not have been the paramount consideration in this debate? I don't think so.

Clean Water. In 1994, 273 PACs associated with industries bent on weakening the Clean Water Act contributed nearly \$8 million to Members of the U.S. House Representatives. Those serving on the committee with jurisdiction over the bill alone received \$1.2 million. So far, the industries' efforts appear to be paying off. Water quality standards have been rolled back. As a foundation committed to cleaning up the Great Lakes, we are all too aware that money talks . . . and it may speak loudly enough to drown out 25 years of progress on environmental issues.

Pesticides. The environmental working group—one of our foundation's grantees—issued a report late last year showing that sponsors of legislation designed to weaken Federal pesticide laws received \$3.1 million in contributions from 44 industry-supported PACs. This represented nearly a 100-percent increase over donations made during a comparable period two years earlier. What accounted for this sudden spurt of generosity? Industry was reacting to a Federal court decision that threatened to ban dozens of cancer-causing pesticides. In the end the pesticide industry got largely what it wanted. Whether the Americans people won is another matter altogether, money talks.

Guns. Last year the National Rifle Association poured \$3 million into the campaigns of Congressional candidates who support that organization's agenda—an agenda, I might add, which is at odds with the majority of the American people. The NRA targeted for defeat four Members who had voted in favor of last year's assault weapons ban. Three, including Speaker Tom Foley, lost.

More recently Speaker Gingrich appointed a task force to review current Federal laws pertaining to guns, including the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. All six Members appointed by the speaker are outspoken opponents of gun control, and four received significant NRA financial support during the last election. Will this panel give people who want to quell the epidemic of gun violence a chance to be heard? And if it does, will it listen to what they, and so many others have to say? Or will they be—if you'll excuse the expression—shot down by the influence of money?

State Contracts. In fiscal year 1992, the State of Illinois contracted with businesses and individuals for \$4.6 billion worth of goods and services. A third of those contracts—\$1.6 billion—were awarded to campaign contributors of statewide candidates. And about \$437 million in State business went to contributors on a non-bid basis. According to the Illinois State Journal, the dollar amount of the non-bid contracts awarded contributors was six times greater than the value of the contracts awarded non-contributors. For the more enterprising among us, I think there's a message here. Money talks.

Health Care. Despite solemn promises from nearly all quarters, the American people didn't get health care reform last year. In the end, reform was swallowed up in a sea of dollars.

I doubt we will ever know how much money was at play. It is conservatively estimated that in 1993 and 1994 the medical professions, insurance industry, pharmaceutical companies and an assortment of business interests spent \$100 million to influence the outcome of the health care debate.

There are some things, thanks to disclosure, that we do know. For example, we know that during the last election cycle health care-related industries poured at least \$25 million into the campaign coffers of Members of Congress. One-third of that largesse was directed to Members serving on the five House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over health care issues.

We know that in 1992 and 1993 at least 85 Members availed themselves of 181 all-expense paid trips sponsored by health care industries—trips designed to help Members learn about health care in out-of-the-way places where distractions could be kept to a minimum. Places like Paris, Montego Bay, and Puerto Rico.

We also know that health care interests hired nearly 100 law, public relations and lobbying firms to do their bidding at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—and that these firms in turn brought 80 or so former high-ranking Federal officials on board, including recently retired Members of Congress, to give their efforts greater authority.

We know that the health insurance association of America spent millions to produce and air its "Harry and Louise" ads—a strategy that almost single-handedly led to a 20-point drop in public approval of the Clinton proposal.

We know that the tobacco industry spent millions more to scuttle a proposed \$2 tax on cigarettes, the revenue from which would have helped finance a new health care system.

We know that the national federation of independent businesses spent even more to kill a mandatory employer tax designed to help pay for universal health care coverage.

We are told that all the pushing and shoving by competing interests around health care reform was a textbook demonstration of democracy at work. We may not like the results, we are told, but this is how a democracy functions and should function.

This is not how a democracy functions. The analysis overlooks one critically important fact. The interests of those with the largest stake in reform—the 39 million Americans without health insurance, the 80 million with pre-existing medical conditions, and the 120 million with lifetime limits on their health insurance policies—were grossly underrepresented. Those most in need of help didn't have an army of lobbyists on capitol hill, couldn't afford television ads, and were in no position to contribute millions of dollars to Members of Congress. On every front, they were heavily outgunned.

When the definitive history of this episode is written, one conclusion will be impossible

to avoid: in the great debate over health care reform, money didn't just talk, it roared.

CASH CONSTITUENTS

Defenders of the current system are quick to point out that suspected overreaching is not proof of official wrongdoing. They are right. But the absence of indictable offenses is a flimsy defense for practices that bring about widespread distrust of the political system.

In the final analysis, what counts is what people believe, and most people believe they are being shortchanged by a system which puts them into one of two classes: cash constituents or non-cash constituents. Cash constituents have regular access to elected officials; non-cash constituents don't. Cash constituents are willing to pay to play; non-cash constituents can't afford to.

If you remember no other statistic I cite tonight, let me offer one that's worth storing away for future reference. In 1992, half of all the money raised by congressional candidates—\$335 million—was provided by one-third of 1 percent of the American people.

Unbelievably, things could get worse. For example, in the name of deficit reduction, Senate Republicans recently tried to scrap the public finance system for presidential candidates—arguably, the most important and durable reform coming out of the Watergate era. The effort was narrowly beaten back.

Congress has already passed legislation that would significantly reduce the budget of the Federal Election Commission. Unless President Clinton vetoes this bill, the agency's ability to ensure financial disclosure by political candidates and committees will be severely crippled. In an unusually blunt letter to Members of Congress, the commission's chairman recently warned that a deep cut could lead "the public, fairly or not, to suspect that Congress is punishing the agency for doing its job."

Now, if these developments were not enough for one season, G. Gordon Liddy, the former Nixon aide and mastermind of the Watergate break-in 23 years ago, has just been honored with the freedom of speech award by the national association of talk show hosts. It's enough to make you question the Bible's assurances about the meek inheriting the earth.

THE FOUNDATION'S APPROACH

In the face of all these problems, what is the Joyce Foundation's strategy? Our goal is to make the issue of campaign finance a more prominent part of the public policy agenda. And we are seeking to do that through projects emphasizing expanded news media coverage, public education, fresh analyses of campaign finance practices and improved disclosure and regulation. Through the work of our grantees, we hope to create incentives that will help persuade lawmakers to face up to and finally meet their responsibilities.

I should quickly add that the foundation is not promoting any particular reform approach. But we believe that reform, if it is worthy of that name, must at a minimum control the costs of campaigns, increase political competition, encourage voting and restore the public's confidence in the fairness of elections and in the integrity of the policymaking process. Two foundation-supported projects designed to move us in these directions deserve mention tonight.

The Illinois Project. Twenty years have elapsed since Illinois last overhauled its campaign finance system. It is time to do it again. Here is a system in which the only limits are the sky itself. In Illinois, there are: no limits on the amount of campaign money candidates can raise; no limits on the sources of campaign contributions; no limits

on the amount of money candidates can spend; no limits on the size of contributions individual and institutional donors can make; no limits on the vast war chests candidates can accumulate and carry over from one election to the next; no limits on candidates' use of campaign funds for personal and non-campaign related expenses; and no limits on leadership PACs.

The only restrictions worth noting are those intended to inhibit public access to and understanding of the financial disclosure reports that candidates and committees are required to file periodically with the State board of elections. And, if perchance, you even rummage through these records, you'll quickly discover that it's virtually impossible to figure out, beyond names and addresses, who the State's political high rollers really are. Illinois has the distinction of being one of a handful of States that still does not require candidates to list the occupation of their contributors.

Illinois' campaign finance system makes the federal system look relatively tame, if not pristine. And that is why the Joyce Foundation is supporting a 2-year, \$200,000 examination of this system by the State's leading public affairs magazine, *Illinois Issues*.

By this fall, the magazine's project staff will have put the finishing touches on a vast computerized database that will include all contributions of \$25 or more made to legislative and statewide candidates since 1990. And as much occupational information about donors as can be independently obtained will also be incorporated into the database.

This reservoir of information will enable *Illinois Issues* to begin answering a question that should intrigue us all: Who is giving how much to whom for what purposes and with what effects? Detailed and customized profiles of individual candidates, interest groups, regions and districts will be developed. These reports, which will be made available to the States news media, are certain to shed light on the often murky financial behavior of candidates and donors alike. Citizens wishing direct access to the database will be able to get it at relatively low cost through an on-line information network.

In addition, the magazine has assembled a distinguished panel of citizens who over the next year and a half will examine various alternatives for reforming the State's campaign finance rules. This task force which is comprised of scholars, journalists, political practitioners, and civic leaders—including Senator PAUL SIMON, two university presidents and your own Cindy Canary—is expected to formulate and advance a set of reform recommendations late next year. But before doing so, the panel will consult with and collect testimony from a diverse cross-section of interested Illinoisans as well as carefully weigh the reform experiences of other jurisdictions across the country.

Money, Politics and the Public Voice. As angry as people are about the influence private money exerts on our politics, there is no groundswell of popular support for one reform approach or another. Indeed, there is no clear and loud public demand for change—at least not the kind of impatient outcry elected officials are inclined to take notice of and heed.

The foundation is convinced that reform will come more quickly if the public is brought into this debate in a much bigger way. But this is not small challenge. After all, just how do you clear a space at the policymaking table and pull up a chair for the American people? Well, that's the riddle the League of Women Voters education fund, in partnership with the Benton Foundation and the Hardwood group, have set out to answer

over the next 2 years. And the Joyce Foundation is betting nearly half a million dollars that this unusual consortium will help solve that mystery.

About a year from now thousands of citizens, armed with background and discussion materials, will meet in neighborhoods and communities across America to learn about the campaign finance problem, to debate various reform options, and to clarify and make known to their elected Representatives the changes they want and are willing to support. These will not be undisciplined rap and complaint sessions but instead structured and expertly facilitated conversations that we hope and believe will yield the kind of reasoned and considered policy judgments that the political community will find difficult to dismiss.

It is our hope that other groups—like the American association of retired persons, the American association of community colleges and the university extension system—will eventually join the campaign, adding to the league's considerable organizational reach and enabling the project to host at least one forum in each of the country's 435 congressional districts.

To ensure that every step of this process is fully amplified, including the final results and public interactions between project participants and elected officials, the project is developing an aggressive public information and media outreach strategy. In addition, video, teleconferences, computers and other communication technologies will be used to connect the project's participants with each other, the news media and policymakers.

To date, the league-led project team has hired a staff of seasoned organizers, engaged the services of a professional communications firm, assembled an advisory panel of campaign finance experts and completed an exhaustive review of the vast literature on this subject. In the coming days, it will launch a series of focus groups in order to get a better fix on what people know and don't know about the campaign finance problem, how they talk about it, and how they would fix it, were it in their power to do so. These insights will aid in the development of the project's educational materials and a deliberative process designed to assist non-experts work through a complex policy problem like campaign finance.

The two projects I've briefly sketched out are ambitious, complex, expensive and labor intensive. If they are to succeed, the sponsors will need all the help they can garner. I know the ED fund and *Illinois Issues* would warmly welcome your participation and assistance, and I hope you will be able to offer some of each in the coming months.

Although this organization's plate is always full and this year is no exception, I would strongly encourage you to leave a little room for campaign finance reform. Your reputation for raising public consciousness on important issues, for educating and mobilizing citizens and for talking sense to lawmakers could make a huge difference in ending those campaign finance practices that often make the realization of the league's own policy goals needlessly difficult. So I hope you will join us; the water's fine and sure to get a lot warmer in the next year.

CONCLUSION

If I sound perturbed about the problem of money in politics, it's because I am. It's a problem, after all, that hits very close to home. This year the foundation will award nearly \$6 million in grants to scores of organizations that are working tirelessly and in most cases with limited resources to repair and reserve the environment for future generations. These nonprofit organizations are in no position to compete financially with

those interests whose commitments to environmental protection often take a backseat to other economic considerations.

It's not a fair fight, when the congressional co-sponsors of amendments to the Safe Water Drinking Act get 60 times more money from businesses supporting the bill than from pro-environmental groups. And it's even less fair, when the co-sponsors of the private property owners bill of rights get 300 times more money from the bill's industry supporters than from pro-environmental groups. For this reason, in addition to all the others I've discussed, the foundation has a keen interest in cleaning up the campaign finance system. If the playing field were more level, I know that our conservation grantees and those working in other areas, like gun violence, could more than hold their own against the forces that oppose them. But as things now stand, every fight involving the good guys is uphill these days, and that's not right.

In conclusion, let me say this. The continuing debate on campaign finance reform is more than a squabble over how to revise the rules of the road. The debate is really about fundamentals and first principles; it is at bottom a struggle for the soul of the American political system. And that is a struggle which people who yearn for a more open, participatory and accountable politics—people like you and me—dare not take lightly, walk away from or lose. •

LIVESTOCK GRAZING ACT

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I recently wrote a letter to the principal author of the Livestock Grazing Act outlining my concerns over this bill. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
WASHINGTON, DC,
July 13, 1995.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE: The purpose of this letter is to let you know that I have added my name as a cosponsor of S. 852, the "Livestock Grazing Act." Livestock operators are a vital part of Montana's economic base. It is my belief that S. 852, as originally drafted, offers the security that ranchers need to remain viable during these uncertain economic times.

The men and women who make their living off the land form the backbone of Montana. Without the rancher, many small communities would simply cease to exist. Absent ranching, the wide open spaces that provide elk winter range, wildlife corridors and critical wildlife habitat would be jeopardized by subdivision and development. In short, ranching is fundamental to preserving much of what makes Montana, "the last, best place."

As you move to Energy Committee markup of S. 852, I ask that you satisfy three specific concerns that are critical to my support of this legislation. These concerns are as follows:

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

While the federal public lands are essential to many livestock operators, they are also deeply valued by the general public. Clean streams and healthy wildlife populations are just as important to Montana's sportsmen as predictability and security in the federal grazing rules are to the rancher. S. 852 must ensure that the public is granted full participation in the decision-making process affecting the use and management of these lands. If it does not, I will work to see that com-

prehensive public participation is assured before this legislation reaches a final vote on the Senate floor.

We must not lose sight of the fact that these are public lands; they belong to all of us. Ranchers, hunters, fishermen, bird-watchers, motorized recreationists and every other segment of the user public must be granted an equal seat at the table. Montana has already worked with the BLM to identify and select individuals interested in working together to improve our public range lands. Just last week, the BLM and the Governor of Montana jointly appointed 45 individuals to three advisory councils to begin this important work. S. 852 cannot deprive these Montanans of their fundamental democratic right of participation.

2. MORE ON-THE-GROUND WORK, LESS PAPERWORK

With over 30 percent of our land base in federal ownership, many Montanans interact on a daily basis with federal land managers. Perhaps our biggest criticism with all federal land management agencies is the ever-increasing allocation of limited resources to paperwork and bureaucracy rather than actual work in the field. The men and women who work for these agencies share this sentiment, and are frustrated by it.

Having spent a rainy day working with ranchers, conservationists and government personnel to rehabilitate a stream in the Blackfoot Valley, I have seen firsthand how much good can be done with a little start-up money and a few strong backs. As the budgets of our land management agencies continue to shrink, their resources must be directed to the field, rather than to increased bureaucracy and paperwork. S. 852 must de-emphasize paperwork and get the money to the allotment level where we can see tangible benefits come from our tax dollars.

3. STEWARDSHIP

Over 70 percent of BLM grazing lands in Montana are rated good to excellent, while less than 5 percent is in poor condition. These numbers demonstrate that our public lands grazers are largely good stewards of the land. Still, there is room for improvement. S. 852 must include a mechanism that gives permittees increased responsibility for bringing the public range into good to excellent condition. Such solutions cannot be rigidly imposed by those who are removed from the land and the unique challenges that exist on each allotment. We will see improvement only if these solutions come from the permittee. S. 852 should encourage innovative local stewardship.

In closing, I look forward to working with you on this very important issue to our states. It is my belief that the fundamental thrust of S. 852, coupled with these recommendations, will serve to promote responsible public lands stewardship while providing the necessary security that our ranchers need to remain viable in Montana and throughout the West.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

MAX BAUCUS. •

EDMUNDO GONZALES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the U.S. Senate in its recent confirmation of Mr. Edmundo Gonzales to be Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Labor. I am confident that Mr. Gonzales will continue to be an asset to that department and to the United States.

Mr. Gonzales is originally from El Rito, a small town in northern New

Mexico. He graduated from Arizona State University with an education major, and also received a MBA and Juris Doctor from the University of Colorado. He has worked as an attorney, and as a manager for U.S. West, Inc. In 1993, he came to the Labor Department, where he has worked on management standards and in the Office of the American Workplace.

Throughout his career, Mr. Gonzales has demonstrated a commitment to public service. While working for U.S. West, Inc., in addition to other duties, he served as an Executive on Loan to the Denver Public Schools, working on budgetary and strategic planning matters. He has served as President of the Hispanic Bar Association, and on a number of charitable and cultural boards.

We as a Nation are fortunate to have a person of Mr. Gonzales's caliber serving our Government. I wish him well in his new position.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEES AND REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 150, submitted earlier today by Senators DOLE and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 150) to authorize testimony by Senate employees and representation by Senate legal counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered and agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble reads as follows:

S. RES. 150

Whereas, the plaintiffs in Barnstead Broadcasting corporation and BAF Enterprises, Inc. v. Offshore Broadcasting Corporation, Civ. No. 94-2167, a civil action pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, are seeking the deposition testimony of Barbara Riehle and John Seggerman, Senate employees who work for Senator John Chafee;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;